

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 13, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the Office Action of February 13, 2008, the Examiner continues to maintain that the “interference”, which was defined in the specification as “a difference in distance between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base along the tire radial direction measured before and after mounting the bead portion on the rim”(emphasis added), can only be measured directly beneath the bead core. Applicant believes the Examiner’s confusion comes from the “interference” being radially defined relative to the bead core. Since the “interference” is being defined relative to the bead core, the Examiner asserts that the “interference” cannot be measured anywhere but directly beneath the bead core even though there is no explicit requirement to do so in the specification.

Therefore, the specification has been amended to define the “interference” without reference to the bead core, and to thereby clarify the intended meaning of “interference”. Specifically, the specification now defines the “interference” as “the amount of compression of the tire bead base in a radial direction of the tire when mounted on a rim”.

Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is fully supported in the original disclosure. Figure 2 clearly shows that there is compression of the bead base in the radial direction along the entire width of the bead base. Further, paragraph 18, line 22 describes the reference character “t” as corresponding to an interference being shown in Fig. 2. In Figure 2, the interference “t” is being measured at the innermost edge of the bead base (bead toe 5), a point not directly beneath the bead core. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the original disclosure provides more than sufficient support for measuring the interference in areas to the right and to the left of the bead core.

Further, Applicant’s representative contacted the Examiner via telephone on April 18, 2008 to discuss amending the specification. During that telephone conversation, Applicant’s representative pointed out that support for this amendment could be found at least in the sections of the original disclosure discussed above. After reviewing the sections of the disclosure discussed above, the Examiner agreed that there is sufficient support in the original disclosure to support the amendments made herein, and indicated that this amendment would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicant further submits that the original disclosure fully supports the amendments made to the specification. While the interference can be measured at various places both beneath and not beneath the bead core, many of the aspects of the present invention are focused on the interference under and near the bead core, as detailed in the claims. In other words, the interference is significant with respect to its lateral or width position relative to the bead core, but it can actually be measured anywhere along the width of the bead core.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 are not indefinite, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/SMG/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 13, 2008